

Hoyer	McKinney	Roybal-Allard
Inslee	Meek (FL)	Sabo
Jackson (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez
Jackson-Lee	Menendez	Sanders
(TX)	Miller, George	Sandlin
Johnson, E. B.	Minge	Sawyer
Jones (OH)	Mink	Schakowsky
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Scott
Kildee	Moore	Serrano
Kilpatrick	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Kind (WI)	Murtha	Slaughter
Kleccka	Nadler	Snyder
Kucinich	Napolitano	Spratt
LaFalce	Oberstar	Stupak
Lampson	Obey	Tanner
Lantos	Olver	Tauscher
Larson	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thurman
Lipinski	Pastor	Tierney
Lofgren	Payne	Towns
Luther	Pelosi	Turner
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Udall (NM)
Markey	Pomeroy	Visclosky
Mascara	Rahall	Waters
Matsui	Rangel	Watt (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Reyes	Waxman
McDermott	Rivers	Woolsey
McGovern	Rodriguez	Wynn
McIntyre	Roemer	

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 6, 2000.
Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope from the White House on Saturday, November 4, 2000 at 3:55 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he returns without his approval, H.R. 4392, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001".

Sincerely yours,
JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—
VETO MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:
Today, I am disapproving H.R. 4392, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001," because of one badly flawed provision that would have made a felony of unauthorized disclosures of classified information. Although well intentioned, that provision is overbroad and may unnecessarily chill legitimate activities that are at the heart of a democracy.

I agree that unauthorized disclosures can be extraordinarily harmful to United States national security interests and that far too many such disclosures occur. I have been particularly concerned about their potential effects on the sometimes irreplaceable intelligence sources and methods on which we rely to acquire accurate and timely information I need in order to make the most appropriate decisions on matters of national security. Unauthorized disclosures damage our intelligence relationships abroad, compromise intelligence gathering, jeopardize lives, and increase the threat of terrorism. As Justice Stewart stated in the Pentagon Papers case, "it is elementary that the successful conduct of international diplomacy and the maintenance of an effective national defense require both confidentiality and secrecy. Other nations can hardly deal with this Nation in an atmosphere of mutual trust unless they can be assured that their confidences will be kept . . . and the development of considered and intelligent international policies would be impossible if those charged with their formulation could not communicate with each other freely." Those who disclose classified information inappropriately thus commit a gross breach of the public trust and may recklessly put our national security at risk. To the extent that existing sanctions have proven insufficient to address and deter unauthorized disclosures, they should be

strengthened. What is in dispute is not the gravity of the problem, but the best way to respond to it.

In addressing this issue, we must never forget that the free flow of information is essential to a democratic society. Justice Stewart also wrote in the Pentagon Papers case that "the only effective restraint upon executive policy in the areas of national defense and international affairs may lie in an enlightened citizenry—in an informed and critical public opinion which alone can here protect the values of democratic government."

Justice Brandeis reminded us that "those who won our independence believed . . . that public discussion is a political duty; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American government." His words caution that we must always tread carefully when considering measures that may limit public discussion—even when those measures are intended to achieve laudable, indeed necessary, goals.

As President, therefore, it is my obligation to protect not only our Government's vital information from improper disclosure, but also to protect the rights of citizens to receive the information necessary for democracy to work. Furthering these two goals requires a careful balancing, which must be assessed in light of our system of classifying information over a range of categories. This legislation does not achieve the proper balance. For example, there is a serious risk that this legislation would tend to have a chilling effect on those who engage in legitimate activities. A desire to avoid the risk that their good faith choice of words—their exercise of judgment—could become the subject of a criminal referral for prosecution might discourage Government officials from engaging even in appropriate public discussion, press briefings, or other legitimate official activities. Similarly, the legislation may unduly restrain the ability of former Government officials to teach, write, or engage in any activity aimed at building public understanding of complex issues. Incurring such risks is unnecessary and inappropriate in a society built on freedom of expression and the consent of the governed and is particularly inadvisable in a context in which the range of classified materials is so extensive. In such circumstances, this criminal provision would, in my view, create an undue chilling effect.

The problem is compounded because this provision was passed without benefit of public hearings—a particular concern given that it is the public that this law seeks ultimately to protect. The Administration shares the process burden since its deliberations lacked the thoroughness this provision warranted, which in turn led to a failure to apprise the Congress of the concerns I am expressing today.

I deeply appreciate the sincere efforts of Members of Congress to address

NOT VOTING—86

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Moakley
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Neal
Andrews	Ganske	Pascrell
Army	Gilchrest	Peterson (MN)
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Becerra	Green (TX)	Pitts
Bishop	Hall (OH)	Price (NC)
Borski	Hansen	Rogan
Boswell	Hefley	Rothman
Boyd	Hoeffel	Rush
Brown (FL)	Holden	Sisisky
Burr	Hulshof	Smith (WA)
Carson	Jefferson	Souder
Clay	John	Stark
Coburn	Kaptur	Stenholm
Cooksey	Kasich	Strickland
Coyne	Kennedy	Talent
Cubin	Klink	Taylor (NC)
Danner	Largent	Velazquez
DeFazio	Latham	Wamp
Deutsch	Lowe	Weiner
Diaz-Balart	Maloney (NY)	Weldon (FL)
Dickey	McCarthy (NY)	Wexler
Dunn	McCrery	Weygand
Edwards	McIntosh	Whitfield
Ehrlich	McNulty	Wilson
Farr	Meehan	Wise
Filner	Millender-	
Forbes	McDonald	
Fossella	Miller (FL)	

□ 1837

Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 596, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during rollcall vote No. 595 and rollcall vote No. 596. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 595 and "nay" on roll call vote No. 596.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives: